

2-12-9

(McCormack) ^{Amerson +}
^{Nogoraki}

To justify ~~that~~ is

to negate IHL or SB

distinction

(International Humanitarian Law)

2) on real circumstances

what of (b) on supposed
circumstances?

or (c) on any hypothetical

circumstances when survival of

US is not at stake?

(ICJ comment) (NATO)

- Opening of WWII
shows possibility of
[actual] restraint
of both sides
relating to appeal
of FDR, committee of
IVFU (of, non-war)

- but also, fragility of
restraint, given
1) overreactions, misinterpretations
2/ Miscalculation
[potential disruption]

2nd. fin drawn (by UK)
to escape from constraints
- Unfused of technical
limitations

Unfused of
alternatives

& political incentives
to "do something"

(lack of alternatives:
political ends...

Political threat
like 82nd B-F
Salazar (effect on me)

Pearl Harbor -
military targets
deception
provocation of
support (vulnerable)
deterrent forces (1st strike
cap)
(Roberts Wobblitzer
influence on RAND)

but: fed. infiltration
activities

aggression
(unprotected training,
supine cap. - like
disarmament blots)

live as a military
obedience!

(terror, morale
stealing roads in France,
Poland

over words & forms
familiar (Aesthetics)

us. "distinction"

see effective torture:
threats in. familiar
(see bluffs, uncertainty)

NOW APPLY "LAW"
to Great Powers
that have not been
occupied?

(Might ~~there~~ have
been war crimes trials
of Soviets during this
occupation?! or, French?
Germans?!

Japanese in China?